arXiv:1603.04345v1 [math.AG] 14 Mar 2016

THE MOTIVE OF A SMOOTH THETA DIVISOR

HUMBERTO A. DIAZ

Abstract. We prove a motivic version of the Lefschetz hyperplane theorem for a smooth ample divisor Θ on an Abelian variety. We use this to construct a motive P that realizes the primitive cohomology of Θ.

1. Introduction

Let k be an algebraically closed field. Given a smooth projective variety X of dimension d over k and a Weil cohomology H^*, there is a decomposition of the diagonal $[\Delta_X] \in H^{2d}(X \times X)$ into its Künneth components:

$$\Delta_X = \Delta_{0,X} + ... + \Delta_{2d,X} \in H^{2d}(X \times X) \cong \bigoplus H^j(X) \otimes H^{2d-j}(X)$$

It is one of Grothendieck's standard conjectures ([7] Section 4) that these Künneth components arise from algebraic cycles; i.e., that there exist correspondences $\pi_{j,X} \in CH^d(X \times X)$ for which $cl(\pi_{j,X}) = \Delta_{j,X}$ under the cycle class map $cl : CH^d(X \times X) \to H^{2d}(X \times X)$. We can state a stronger version of this conjecture as follows:

Conjecture 1.1 (Chow-Künneth)**.** *There exist correspondences $\pi_{j,X} \in CH^d(X \times X)$ satisfying:*

(a) $\pi_{j,X}^2 = \pi_{j,X},\ \pi_{j,X} \circ \pi_{j',X} = 0$ *for* $j \neq j'$
(b) $\sum \pi_{j,X} = \Delta_X$
(c) $cl(\pi_{j,X}) = \Delta_{j,X}$ *for any choice of Weil cohomology.*

In this stronger version, the correspondences $\pi_{j,X}$ are actually idempotents, which gives Chow motives $\mathfrak{h}^j(X) = (X, \pi_{j,X}, 0)$. Moreover, the decomposition of the diagonal into *orthogonal components* gives a decomposition of the motive of X as $\bigoplus \mathfrak{h}^j(X)$. An important problem in the theory of motives is to understand these "underlying" objects $\mathfrak{h}^j(X)$ that represent the various degrees of cohomology (for every choice of cohomology). The Chow-Künneth conjecture is known to hold in some important cases: curves, surfaces ([10]), complete intersections in $\mathbb{P}^n$ ([11] Chapter 6), Abelian varieties ([2]), elliptic modular varieties ([4]).

Suppose that A is an Abelian variety of dimension g and $i : \Theta \hookrightarrow A$ is a smooth ample divisor. The first goal of this note is then to prove the following:

The author would like to thank Chad Schoen, his advisor, and Bruno Kahn for their help with edits.

Theorem 1.1. *There exist correspondences $\pi_{j,\Theta} \in CH^{g-1}(\Theta \times \Theta)$ satisfying conjecture 1.1.*

The Lefschetz hyperplane theorem gives isomorphisms $i^* : H^j(A) \to H^j(\Theta)$ for $j < g-1$ and $i_* : H^j(\Theta) \to H^{j+2}(A)$ for $j > g-1$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 gives a particular set of idempotents $\pi_{j,\Theta}$ and we set $\mathfrak{h}^j(\Theta) = (\Theta, \pi_{j,\Theta}, 0)$. We also set $\mathfrak{h}^j(A) = (A, \pi_{j,A}, 0)$, where $\pi_{j,A}$ are the canonical idempotents constructed in [2]. We are then able to prove the following motivic version of the Lefschetz hyperplane theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *(a) The pull-back $\mathfrak{h}^j(i) := \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} : \mathfrak{h}^j(A) \to \mathfrak{h}^j(\Theta)$ is an isomorphism for $j < g-1$.*

(b) The push-forward ${}^t\mathfrak{h}^j(i) := \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} : \mathfrak{h}^j(\Theta) \to \mathfrak{h}^{j+2}(A)(1)$ is an isomorphism for $j > g-1$.

(c) $\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i)$ is split-injective and ${}^t\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i)$ is split-surjective.

(d) There is an idempotent $p \in CH^{g-1}(\Theta \times \Theta)$ which is orthogonal to $\pi_{j,\Theta}$ for $j \neq g-1$ and for which the motive $P := (\Theta, p, 0)$ satisfies $H^*(P) = K_\Theta := \ker(i_* : H^{g-1}(\Theta) \to H^{g+1}(A))$.

We can specialize to the case that $k = \mathbb{C}$ and H^* is singular cohomology with $\mathbb{Q}$-coefficients. The primitive cohomology of Θ,

$$K_\Theta = \ker(i_* : H^{g-1}(\Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^{g+1}(A, \mathbb{Q})(1)),$$

is the only Hodge substructure of H^* not coming from A. So, one should expect to encounter difficulty in analyzing the motive P. The simplest nontrivial case is when A is a principally polarized Abelian fourfold and $[\Theta] \in CH^1(A)$ is its principal polarization. In this case, Θ is generally a smooth divisor and $H^*(P) = K_\Theta$ has Hodge level 1. Conjecturally, a motive over $\mathbb{C}$ whose singular cohomology has Hodge level 1 should correspond to an Abelian variety ([**?**] Remark 7.12). We have the following partial result:

Proposition 1.1. *There exists an Abelian variety J such that $\mathfrak{h}^1(J)(-1) \cong P \Leftrightarrow p_* CH_0(\Theta) = 0$.*

2. Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{M}_k$ denote the category of Chow motives over k whose objects are triples (X, π, n), where X is a smooth projective variety of dimension d, $\pi \in CH^d(X \times X)$ is an idempotent and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The morphisms are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_k}((X, \pi, n), (X', \pi', n')) &:= \pi' \circ Cor^{n'-n}(X, X') \circ \pi \\ &= \pi' \circ CH^{d+n'-n}(X \times X') \circ \pi \end{aligned}$$

Here, composition is defined in [3] Chapter 16.1. There is a functor $\mathfrak{h} : \mathcal{V}_k^{opp} \mapsto \mathcal{M}_k$ from the category of smooth projective varieties over k with $\mathfrak{h}(X) = (X, \Delta_X, 0)$ and with $\mathfrak{h}(g) = {}^t\Gamma_g$

for any morphism $g : X \to X'$. A Weil cohomology theory is a functor $H^* : \mathcal{V}_k^{opp} \mapsto Vec_K$ (with K is a field of characteristic 0) satisfying certain axioms (described in [7] Section 4), one of which is the Lefschetz hyperplane isomorphism. Examples include singular, ℓ-adic, crystalline, or de Rham cohomology. This extends to a functor $H^* : \mathcal{M}_k \mapsto Vec_K$, and for $M = (X, \pi, m)$, we have

$$H^j(M) = \pi_* H^{j+2m}(X).$$

Also, there is the extension of scalars functor $()_L : \mathcal{M}_k \mapsto \mathcal{M}_L$ for any field extension $k \subset L$. For $M = (X, \pi, m)$, we will use the notation $M(n) = (X, \pi, m-n)$ and $\mathbb{1}(n) = (\text{Spec } k, \Delta_k, n)$.

Lemma 2.1 (Liebermann)**.** *Let $h_X : X' \vdash X$, $h_Y : Y \vdash Y'$ be correspondences of smooth projective varieties. Then, for $\alpha \in CH^*(X \times Y), \beta \in CH^*(X' \times Y')$, we have*

(a) $(h_X \times h_Y)_*(\alpha) = h_Y \circ \alpha \circ h_X$

(b) When $f : X \to X'$ and $g : Y \to Y'$ are morphisms, $(f \times g)_*(\alpha) = \Gamma_g \circ \alpha \circ {}^t\Gamma_f$.

Proof. See [3] Proposition 16.1.1. □

Theorem 2.1 (Shermenev, Deninger-Murre)**.** *Let A be an Abelian variety of dimension g over k. Then, there is a unique set of idempotents $\{\pi_{j,A}\} \in CH^g(A \times A)$ satisfying conjecture 1.1 and the following relation for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$:*

$$ {}^t\Gamma_n \circ \pi_{j,A} = n^j \cdot \pi_{j,A} = \pi_{j,A} \circ {}^t\Gamma_n \tag{1}$$

Proof. See [2] Theorem 3.1. □

Let $i : \Theta \hookrightarrow A$ be a smooth ample divisor and let $\mathfrak{h}^j(A) = (A, \pi_{j,A}, 0)$ be the motive for the idempotents in Theorem 2.1. Then, we define the *Lefschetz operator*:

$$L_\Theta := \Delta_*(\Theta) \in CH^{g+1}(A \times A).$$

The most essential result for the proofs of theorems 1.1 and 1.2 is the following in [8], a motivic version of the Hard Lefschetz theorem:

Theorem 2.2 (Künnemann)**.** *Assume that $[\Theta] = (-1)_A^*[\Theta] \in CH^1(A)$.*

(a) $(L_\Theta)_*\alpha = \alpha \cup [\Theta]$ *for* $\alpha \in H^*(A)$

(b) The operator $\pi_{2g-j,A} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A} : \mathfrak{h}^j(A)(g-j) \to \mathfrak{h}^{2g-j}(A)$ is an isomorphism of motives for $j \leq g$. That is, there exists a correspondence $\Lambda_\Theta \in CH^{g-1}(A \times A)$ such that the following relations hold for $j \leq g$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A} &= \pi_{j,A} \\ \pi_{2g-j,A} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{2g-j,A} &= \pi_{2g-j,A} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

(c) Set $\pi_{j,A} = 0$ for all $j \notin \{0, 1, ...2g\}$. Then, we have $L_\Theta \circ \pi_{j,A} = \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta$ and $\Lambda_\Theta \circ \pi_{j,A} = \pi_{j-2,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta$.

Proof. See [8] Theorem 4.1. It should be noted that (b) holds more generally for Abelian schemes. It is a technical result that uses properties of the Fourier transform for Chow groups of Abelian schemes. □

By Theorem 2.2 (a) and the projection formula, we have $(L_\Theta)_* = \cup[\Theta] = i_* \circ i^*$. The result below shows that this is true on the level of correspondences:

Lemma 2.2. $L_\Theta = \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \in CH^{g+1}(A \times A)$.

Proof. From the obvious commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Theta & \xrightarrow{\Delta_\Theta} & \Theta \times \Theta \\ {\scriptstyle i}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i\times i} \\ A & \xrightarrow{\Delta_A} & A \times A \end{array} \tag{3}$$

we have $L_\Theta = (\Delta_A)_*(\Theta) = (\Delta_A)_*(i_*1) = (i \times i)_*(\Delta_\Theta) = \Gamma_i \circ \Delta_\Theta \circ {}^t\Gamma_i = \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i$, where the penultimate step follows from Lemma 2.1 (b). □

3. Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Since k is algebraically closed, it's possible to find some $a \in A(k)$ such that $t_a^*[\Theta] \in CH^1(A)$ is invariant under $(-1)^*$. So, we can assume that $(-1)_A^*[\Theta] = [\Theta]$, so that the results of the previous section are applicable.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For the proof, we will need to exhibit correspondences $\pi_{j,\Theta} \in CH^{g-1}(\Theta \times \Theta)$ which satisfy conjecture 1.1. These are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{j,\Theta} &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \text{ for } j < g-1, \\ \pi_{j,\Theta} &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \text{ for } j > g-1, \\ \pi_{g-1,\Theta} &= \Delta_\Theta - \sum_{j \neq g-1} \pi_{j,\Theta}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Since $\sum \pi_{j,\Theta} = \Delta_\Theta$ holds by definition, it suffices to check conditions (a) and (c) of conjecture 1.1. For $j < g-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{j,\Theta}^2 &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i = \pi_{j,\Theta} \end{aligned}$$

Here, the second equality holds by Lemma 2.2, the third holds by Theorem 2.2 (b). Similarly, for $j > g-1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{j,\Theta}^2 &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i = \pi_{j,\Theta}\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\pi_{j,\Theta}^2 = \pi_{j,\Theta}$ for $j \neq g-1$. Before proving the same for $j = g-1$, we show that the orthogonality condition of (a) (in conjecture 1.1) holds; that is, $\pi_{j,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j',\Theta} = 0$ for $j \neq j'$ and $j, j' \neq g-1$. We do this for the case of $j \neq j' < g-1$:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{j,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j',\Theta} &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j',A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j'} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j'-1} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j',A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j'} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j'-1} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \pi_{j',A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j'} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j'-1} \circ \Gamma_i \\ &= 0\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Again, the second equality holds by Lemma 2.2 and the last equality follows from the orthogonality condition in Theorem 2.1. The third equality holds because we have

$$\pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} = \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A}$$

which follows by repeated application of Theorem 2.2 (c). The remaining cases of orthogonality ($j \neq j'$ and $j, j' \neq g-1$) are identical to (5).

What remains for the verification of condition (a) is to show that:

(i) $\pi_{g-1,\Theta}^2 = \pi_{g-1,\Theta}$
(ii) $\pi_{g-1,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} = 0 = \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ \pi_{g-1,\Theta}$ for $j \neq g-1$

For (i), let $\pi = \sum_{k \neq g-1} \pi_{j,\Theta}$. Since the summands are mutually orthogonal idempotents by the preceding verifications, it follows that $\pi^2 = \pi$. Since $\pi_{g-1,\Theta} = \Delta_\Theta - \pi$ by definition, we have

$$\pi_{g-1,\Theta}^2 = (\Delta_\Theta - \pi)^2 = \Delta_\Theta + \pi^2 - 2\pi = \Delta_\Theta - \pi = \pi_{g-1,\Theta}$$

For (ii), let $j \neq g-1$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{g-1,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} = (\Delta_\Theta - \pi) \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} &= \pi_{j,\Theta} - \sum_{k \neq g-1} \pi_{k,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \\ &= \pi_{j,\Theta} - \pi_{j,\Theta} = 0\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds since $\pi_{k,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} = 0$ for $j \neq k$. Similarly, one has $0 = \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ \pi_{g-1,\Theta}$. This completes the verification of item (a) in conjecture 1.1.

Finally, we prove (c) in conjecture 1.1. It suffices to show that $\pi_{j,\Theta}$ acts as the identity on $H^j(\Theta)$ and trivially on $H^{j'}(\Theta)$ for $j \neq j'$ and any Weil cohomology H^*. One easily reduces

this to the case that $j \neq g-1$. We will verify this for $j < g-1$. Since $\pi_{j,A}$ acts as 0 on $H^{j'}(A)$ for $j \neq j'$, we need only show that $\pi_{j,\Theta}$ acts as the identity on $H^j(\Theta)$. To this end, let $\phi := \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i$ so that

$$\pi_{j,\Theta} = {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \phi$$

Since H^* is a Weil cohomology, ${}^t\Gamma_{i*} = i^* : H^j(A) \to H^j(\Theta)$ is an isomorphism (see [7]). Moreover, by Hard Lefschetz, $(\phi \circ {}^t\Gamma_i)_* = (\Lambda_\Theta^{g-j})_* \circ (L_\Theta^{g-j})_*$ is the identity on $H^j(A)$. Thus, i^* and ϕ_* are inverses, from which it follows that $(\pi_{j,\Theta})_*$ is the identity on $H^j(\Theta)$ for $j < g-1$. The case of $j > g-1$ is nearly identical, only that one uses the fact that i_* is an isomorphism. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The statements of (a) and (b) are that $\mathfrak{h}^j(i)$ and ${}^t\mathfrak{h}^j(i)$ are isomorphisms for $j < g-1$ and $j > g-1$, respectively. To show this, we need to construct their inverse isomorphisms:

$$\phi_j := \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \text{ for } j < g-1$$
$$\phi_j := \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \text{ for } j > g-1$$

Then, for $j < g-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_j \circ \mathfrak{h}^j(i) &= \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \\
&= \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \\
&= \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \circ \pi_{j,A} \\
&= \pi_{j,A}
\end{aligned}$$

where the third and fourth equalities hold by Theorem 2.2 (b). Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{h}^j(i) \circ \phi_j &= \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{g-j} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j-1} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \\
&= \pi_{j,\Theta}^3 = \pi_{j,\Theta}
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $\mathfrak{h}^j(i)$ and ϕ_j are inverses for $j < g-1$, proving (a). For (b), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^t\mathfrak{h}^j(i) \circ \phi_j &= \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \\
&= \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \\
&= \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \\
&= \pi_{j,A}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_j \circ {}^t\mathfrak{h}^j(i) &= \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ L_\Theta^{j-g+1} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g+2} \circ \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \\
&= \pi_{j,\Theta}^3 = \pi_{j,\Theta}
\end{aligned}$$

So, ${}^t\mathfrak{h}^j(i)$ and ϕ_j are inverses for $j > g-1$. For (c), we need to show that $\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i)$ and ${}^t\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i)$ are split-injective and split-surjective, respectively. Their left and right inverses will be:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{g-1} &= \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,\Theta} \\ \psi_{g-1} &= \pi_{g-1,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \pi_{g+1,A}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

To this end, we begin by noting that for $j < g-1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta^{j-g} \circ L_\Theta^{g-j} \\ &= {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Similarly, we have $\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} = \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i$ for $j > g-1$. So, we write $\pi = \sum_{j \neq g-1} \pi_{j,\Theta}$ as before and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_i \circ \pi \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} &= \sum_{j<g-1} \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} + \sum_{j>g-1} \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \\ &= \sum_{j<g-1} \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \pi_{g-1,A} + \sum_{j>g-1} \pi_{j+2,A} \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \\ &= \sum_{j<g-1} L_\Theta \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \pi_{g-1,A} + \sum_{j>g-1} \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \\ &= \sum_{j>g-1} L_\Theta \circ \pi_{j,A} \circ \pi_{g-1,A} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the third equality holds by the mutual orthogonality of $\pi_{j,A}$ and the fourth holds because $L_\Theta \circ \pi_{j,A} = \pi_{j+2,A} \circ L_\Theta$. Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{g-1} \circ \mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i) &= \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,\Theta} \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \\ &= \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \Gamma_i \circ (\Delta_\Theta - \pi) \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \\ &= \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \Gamma_i \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} - \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi \circ {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \\ &= \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ L_\Theta \circ \pi_{g-1,A} = \pi_{g-1,A} \end{aligned}$$

Here, the second term on the third line vanishes by (8). So, $\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i)$ is split-injective. A similar calculation shows that ${}^t\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(i)$ is split-surjective with right inverse ψ_j. The completes the proof of (c).

Finally, for (d) we define:

$$\pi'_{g-1,\Theta} := {}^t\Gamma_i \circ \pi_{g-1,A} \circ \Lambda_\Theta \circ \Gamma_i \in CH^{g-1}(\Theta \times \Theta)$$

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, one can show that $\pi'_{g-1,\Theta}$ is an idempotent, is orthogonal to $\pi_{j,\Theta}$ for $j \neq g-1$. It follows that

$$\pi'_{g-1,\Theta} \circ \pi_{g-1,\Theta} = \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} - \sum_{j \neq g-1} \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} \circ \pi_{j,\Theta} = \pi'_{g-1,\Theta}$$

Similarly, one has $\pi_{g-1,\Theta} \circ \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} = \pi'_{g-1,\Theta}$. Write $\mathfrak{h}_1^{g-1}(\Theta) = (\Theta, \pi'_{g-1,\Theta}, 0)$ for the corresponding motive and define:

$$p := \pi_{g-1,\Theta} - \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} \in CH^{g-1}(\Theta \times \Theta)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} p^2 = (\pi_{g-1,\Theta} - \pi'_{g-1,\Theta})^2 &= \pi^2_{g-1,\Theta} + (\pi'_{g-1,\Theta})^2 - 2\pi_{g-1,\Theta} \circ \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} \\ &= \pi_{g-1,\Theta} + \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} - 2\pi'_{g-1,\Theta} = \pi_{g-1,\Theta} - \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} = p \end{aligned}$$

so that p is an idempotent. Write $P := (\Theta, p, 0)$ for the corresponding motive. We also have

$$p \circ \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} = (\pi_{g-1,\Theta} - \pi'_{g-1,\Theta}) \circ \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} = \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} - \pi'_{g-1,\Theta} = 0$$

so that p and $\pi'_{g-1,\Theta}$ are orthogonal. This gives a decomposition of motives:

$$\mathfrak{h}^{g-1}(\Theta) = P \oplus \mathfrak{h}_1^{g-1}(\Theta) \tag{9}$$

The same argument for Theorem 1.1 (c) shows that $H^*(\mathfrak{h}_1^{g-1}(\Theta)) = i^* H^{g-1}(\Theta)$. Thus, applying H^* to (9), it follows that $H^*(P) = K_\Theta$. □

4. The complementary motive P

Now, let $k = \mathbb{C}$ and H^* be singular cohomology with $\mathbb{Q}$-coefficients. We consider the case of A a prinicipally polarized Abelian variety, whose principal polarization is the class of $i : \Theta \to A$. Since we are interested in the motive P, we need Θ to be nonsingular. The simplest nontrivial case is that of $g = 4$, where a well-known result of Mumford in [9] is that Θ is generally nonsingular. Now, let $K_{\Theta,\mathbb{Q}} := \ker(i_* : H^{g-1}(\Theta, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^{g+1}(A, \mathbb{Q})(1))$ be the primitive cohomology. Then, we have the following:

Lemma 4.1. *K_Θ is a rational Hodge structure of level 1 and dimension 10.*

Proof. Since $H^3(\Theta)$ and $H^3(A)$ both have Hodge level 3, we need to show that $i^* : H^{3,0}(A) \to H^{3,0}(\Theta)$ is an isomorphism. Since this map is already injective, it will suffice to show that $h^{3,0}(\Theta) = h^{3,0}(A) = 4$. By adjunction, $\omega_\Theta \cong \mathcal{O}_\Theta(\Theta)$, so $h^0(\Theta, \mathcal{O}_\Theta(\Theta)) = h^{3,0}(\Theta)$. We can use the long exact sequence to compute $h^0(\Theta, \mathcal{O}_\Theta(\Theta))$:

$$0 \to H^0(A, \mathcal{O}_A) \to H^0(A, \mathcal{O}_A(\Theta)) \xrightarrow{res} H^0(\Theta, \mathcal{O}_\Theta(\Theta)) \to H^1(A, \mathcal{O}_A) \to H^1(A, \mathcal{O}_A(\Theta)) = 0$$

Since Θ is a principal polarization, $h^0(A, \mathcal{O}_A(\Theta)) = 1$ so that the restriction arrow is 0. Moreover, $h^1(A, \mathcal{O}_A) = 4$, so it follows that $h^{3,0}(\Theta) = 4 = h^{3,0}(A)$. Thus, $i^* : H^{3,0}(A) \to H^{3,0}(\Theta)$ is an isomorphism and K_Θ has Hodge level 1. To determine the dimension of K_Θ, we first compute $\chi(\Theta) = c_3(T\Theta)$. Applying the Chern polynomial to the adjunction sequence in this case, one obtains that $c_3(T\Theta) = -c_1(\mathcal{O}(\Theta))^{\cdot 4} = -4! = -24$. Using the Lefschetz hyperplane theorem, one also computes that $\chi(\Theta) = 42 - h^3(\Theta)$, so that $h^3(\Theta) = 66$. Since $h^3(A) = \binom{8}{3} = 56$, it follows that K_Θ has dimension 10. □

Thus, $H^*(P,\mathbb{Q})$ has Hodge level 1 when $g=4$. Now, consider the intermediate Jacobian of K_Θ:

$$J(K_\Theta) = K_{\Theta,\mathbb{C}}/(F^2K_{\Theta,\mathbb{C}} \oplus K_{\Theta,\mathbb{Z}})$$

This is a principally polarized Abelian variety of dimension 5, and we have an isomorphism of rational Hodge structures $H^1(J(K_\Theta),\mathbb{Q})(-1) \cong H^3(P,\mathbb{Q})$. The generalized Hodge conjecture predicts that this isomorphism arises from a correspondence $\Gamma \subset J(K_\Theta)\times\Theta$. The existence of Γ was proved in [5]. One may take this a step further and ask whether $\mathfrak{h}^1(J(K_\Theta))(-1)$ and P are isomorphic as motives. Proposition 1.1 provides a partial answer to this; i.e., we have $\mathfrak{h}^1(J(K_\Theta))(-1) \cong P$ if p acts trivially on $CH_0(\Theta_L)$ for all field extensions $\mathbb{C}\subset L$ (and conversely). We will need the following definition for the proof:

Definition 4.1. *We say that $M=(X,\pi,0)\in\mathcal{M}_k$ has representable Chow group in codimension i if there exists a smooth complete (possible reducible) curve C and $\Gamma\in CH^i(C\times X)$ such that $CH^i_{alg}(M_L) = \pi_{L*}CH^i_{alg}(X_L)$ lies in $\Gamma_{L*}CH^1_{alg}(C_L)\subset CH^i_{alg}(X_L)$ for every field extension $k\subset L$.*

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Suppose that we have some Abelian variety J for which $\mathfrak{h}^1(J)(-1)\cong P$. Then, applying $CH^3(\quad)$ to both sides we obtain

$$p_*CH_0(\Theta) = p_*CH^3(\Theta) \cong CH^3(\mathfrak{h}^1(J)(-1)) = CH^2(\mathfrak{h}^1(J))$$

From [2] Theorem 2.19, we have $CH^2(\mathfrak{h}^1(J))=0$ so that $p_*CH_0(\Theta)=0$. For the converse, observe that Θ can be defined over some field k which is the algebraic closure of a finitely generated over $\mathbb{Q}$. So, let Θ_k be a model for Θ over k. The operators used in the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 (L_Θ, Λ_Θ, and $\pi_{j,A}$) are well-behaved upon passage to an overfield (see [2] and [8]); thus, so is the correspondence $p_k\in Cor^0(\Theta_k\times\Theta_k)$ constructed above. This means that $p_{\mathbb{C}}$ coincides with p (as in the statement of Proposition 1.1), and the assumption that p acts trivially on CH_0 becomes the assumption that

$$p_{L*}CH^3(\Theta_L)=0$$

for all overfields $k\subset L$. Now, let $P=(\Theta_k,p_k,0)$. The task is then to find an Abelian variety J over k for which

$$\mathfrak{h}^1(J)(-1)\cong P$$

To this end, we begin with the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *P has representable Chow group in codimension 2.*

Proof of Lemma. We will drop the subscript k. We use the same argument as in [1]. There is a localization sequence:

$$\varinjlim_{D\subset\Theta} CH^2(\Theta\times D) \xrightarrow{(id_\Theta\times j_D)_*} CH^3(\Theta\times\Theta) \xrightarrow{(id_\Theta\times K)^*} CH^3(\Theta_K) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{10}$$

where the limit runs over all (possibly reducible) subvarieties D of codimension 1 and $K = \mathbb{C}(\Theta)$ is the function field of Θ. We have $(id_\Theta \times K)^*\Delta_\Theta = \eta_K$, the generic point of Θ. From Lemma 2.2 (a), we have $p = p \circ \Delta_\Theta = (p \times id_\Theta)_*\Delta_\Theta$ so that

$$(id_\Theta \times K)^*(p) = (id_\Theta \times K)^*(p \times id_\Theta)_*\Delta_\Theta = p_{K*}(id_\Theta \times K)^*\Delta_\Theta = p_{K*}(\eta_K)$$

Since $p_{K*}(\eta_K) = 0$ by assumption, the exactness of (10) gives some subvariety D and $\alpha \in CH^2(\Theta \times D)$ for which $p = (id_\Theta \times j_D)_*\alpha$. After desingularizing, we can assume that D is smooth (although j_D may no longer be an inclusion). By Lemma 2.2 (b), we have

$$p = (id_\Theta \times j_D)_*\alpha = \Gamma_{j_D} \circ \alpha$$

Thus $p_{L*}CH^2_{alg}(\Theta_L) \subset j_{D*}CH^1_{alg}(D_L)$. By the representability of the Picard functor, this means there is some smooth complete C and some $\Gamma \in CH^1(C \times D)$ such that $\Gamma_{L*}CH^1_{alg}(C_L) = CH^1_{alg}(D_L)$ for all field extension $k \subset L$. This proves the lemma. □

Thus, we see that the Chow group of P is representable in every codimension. By [12] Theorem 3.4, it follows that the motive of P decomposes as

$$\bigoplus \mathbb{1}(i)^{\oplus n_i} \oplus \mathfrak{h}^1(J_i)(-i)$$

for integers n_i and Abelian varieties J_i. Since the cohomology of P is 0 in all but degree 3, this means that $P \cong \mathfrak{h}^1(J)(-1)$ for some Abelian variety J. This gives the proposition. □

Remark 4.1. *A more refined version of Proposition 1.1 is that the Abelian variety can be taken to be $J(K_\Theta)$ in the above notation. Indeed, since we have $H^1(J(K_\Theta), \mathbb{Q})(-1) \cong H^3(P, \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^1(J, \mathbb{Q})(-1)$ (as rational Hodge structures), it follows that J and $J(K_\Theta)$ are isogenous.*

References

[1] S. Bloch, V. Srinivas. *Remarks on correspondences and algebraic cycles*, Amer. J. Math. **105** (1983), 1235-1253.

[2] C. Deninger, J. Murre. *Motivic decomposition of abelian schemes and the Fourier transform*, Compositio Math. **88** (3) (1993), 333-353.

[3] W. Fulton. *Intersection Theory*, Ergebnisse, 3. Folge, Band 2, Springer Verlag (1984).

[4] B. Brent Gordon, M. Hanamura, J.P. Murre. *Relative Chow-Künneth projectors for modular varieties*, J. f. die reine u. angew. Math. **558** (2003), 1-14.

[5] E. Izadi, D. van Straten. *The intermediate Jacobians of the theta divisors of four-dimensional principally polarized abelian varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. **4** (3) (1995), 557-590.

[6] U. Jannsen. *On finite-dimensional motives and Murre's conjecture*, In Algebraic cycles and motives. Vol. 2, volume 344 of London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., pages 112-142. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[7] S. L. Kleiman. *The Standard Conjectures*, In Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991), volume 55 of Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1994), 3-20.

[8] K. Künnemann. *A Lefschetz decomposition for Chow motives of abelian schemes*, Inventiones Mathematicae **113.1** (1993), 85-102.

[9] D. Mumford. *Prym varieties I*, Contributions to Analysis, Academic Press, New York (1974).

[10] J. Murre. *On the motive of an algebraic surface*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik **409** (1990), 190-204.

[11] J. Murre, J. Nagel, C. Peters. *Lectures on the Theory of Pure Motives*, Amer. Mat. Soc., University Lecture Note Series **61** (2013).

[12] C. Vial. *Pure Motives with Representable Chow Groups*, Comptes Rendu **348** (2010), 1191-1195.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DUKE UNIVERSITY, DURHAM, NC

E-mail address: hdiaz123@math.duke.edu